

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 4-10, and 12-16 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, and 12 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 8, and 12.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 12 has been amended to include the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 8 in the body of claim 12. Because the subject matter amended into independent claim 12 is originally found in independent claims 1 and 8, and further already recited in the preamble of claim 12, it is believed that this amendment requires no new search or further consideration by the Examiner. Further, no new matter is added by way of this amendment.

Drawings

Further to the request made in the Response to the Office Action dated November 23, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner acknowledge the drawings submitted on May 31, 2001 as formal.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0103881 (“Granade”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed towards the development of applications for mobile, wireless-connected devices (*e.g.*, cell phones, PDAs, pagers, point of sale terminals, etc.).

Claims 1 and 8 recite a method for developing an application for a wireless-connected device by integrating an emulator of the wireless-connected device (*i.e.*, software which emulates a wireless-connected device) with a module used to develop the application, where the module includes one or more development tools used to develop the application. The emulator and module containing the development tools are further integrated into an integrated development environment (IDE) residing on a single system. The IDE is software that creates a development environment on the system on which the IDE is integrated. Thus, the emulator is used within an IDE to execute the application created with the developments tools.

The IDE dynamically downloads the implementation and facilitates the emulator to be used for execution of applications for wireless-connected devices (*See Specification, page 12, paragraph [0048]*). Using an IDE to execute the module with tools for developing applications for wireless-connected devices allows the programming to be simplified and streamlined. The IDE allows for the ability to program, observe, and test application for wireless-connected devices without requiring downloads of applications onto a particular device to test the application (*See Specification, page 20, paragraph [0067]*).

In contrast to the claimed invention, Granade discloses a method and system for integrating an application executing on a *backend system* with a mobile device that communicates over a network with the application (*See Granade, Abstract and paragraph 0025*). Thus, rather than developing an application to execute on a wireless-connected device, Granade discloses *integrating* an already developed application with a mobile device. Developing an application for a wireless-connected device involves creating an application that did not exist before, and tailoring the application specifically for the execution on the wireless-connected device. Integrating an application with a mobile device, as disclosed by Granade, involves

taking an already developed application, which was not originally created for a mobile device, and changing the interface(s) of the application so that the application can run on the mobile device (or communicate with the mobile device). In fact, Granade specifically recites that applications are integrated with mobile devices by “unifying the interfaces to both the backend applications and the mobile devices” (*See* Granade, paragraph 0025).

Turning to the rejection of the claims, the Examiner asserts that Granade discloses each and every limitation of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. As described above, because Granade is directed towards integration of an application with a mobile device, Granade cannot possibly disclose the limitation “combining, in a module, a plurality of development tools used in the *creation* of the application,” as recited by independent claim 1. Integrating an already developed application would not involve creation of the application as required by claim 1 of the present invention, because the application already exists for the method disclosed in Granade.

Further, Granade fails to disclose the limitation “integrating the module with an emulator of the wireless-connected device,” as recited by independent claim 1. The Examiner references paragraph [0028], reference number 103 of Granade in asserting that Granade discloses the aforementioned limitation. However, the cited portion of Granade recites a *backend systems emulator*, not an emulator of a wireless-connected device (*See* Granade, paragraph [0028]). More specifically, Granade recites that the backend systems emulator:

“is used for testing mobile application platform
108 before deploying platform 108 in a “live” setting.
Backend systems emulator 103 simulates the
interaction between mobile application server 112 and

backend systems 102.”

Clearly, the emulator disclosed in Granade is distinct from the emulator recited in the claimed invention because the emulator of the claimed invention emulates an actual *wireless-connected device*, and **not** a backend system or the interaction between a server and the backend system. The functionality and design of a backend system and a wireless-connected device is completely different.

Moreover, Granade fails to disclose the limitation “using the emulator to execute the application developed using the module within the IDE,” as recited by independent claim 1. Again, it is clear that because Granade fails to develop an application, Granade cannot possibly disclose executing an application *developed* in an IDE using tools provided by the module. Furthermore, the application of Granade is not *executed using an emulator*, because the emulator of Granade emulates a backend system and the interaction of a server with the backend system, whereas in the claimed invention, the application developed for a particular wireless-connected device is actually executed using an emulator that functions as the wireless-connected device (*i.e.*, emulates the wireless-connected device).

In view of the above, it is clear that Granade fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Granade. Further, independent claim 8 includes similar allowable subject matter and is allowable over Granade for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Granade in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,666,399 (“Bales”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Granade fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 8. Specifically, Granade fails to disclose an emulator that emulates a wireless-connected device, developing an application for execution on the emulator of the wireless-connected device, and integrating a module of development tools for the application with the emulator of the wireless-connected device. Further, Bales fails to supply that which Granade lacks.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Bales discloses a terminal emulator application that controls the telecommunication link assigned to a wireless terminal. The terminal emulator application disclosed in Bales emulates a type of telecommunication terminal that would be connected to the telecommunication link (*See* Bales, Figure 1), whereas the emulator of the present invention emulates an entire wireless-connected device. Further, the terminal emulator application described in Bales is not integrated into an IDE, as recited in claims 1, and 8 of the present invention. Thus, Bales fails to disclose an emulator of a wireless-connected device, as recited by independent claims 1 and 8, and therefore cannot possibly disclose “integrating the module with an emulator of the wireless connected device,” as required by the claimed invention.

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Granade and Bales, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 4-7, 9,

and 10 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Further, independent claim 12 has been amended to include similar allowable subject matter (*i.e.*, an emulator of a wireless-connected device used to execute an application developed for the wireless-connected device), and is patentable over Granade and Bales for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 8. Dependent claim 13 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Granade in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,243 (“Putzolu”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Granade fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 8. Specifically, Granade fails to disclose “combining, in a module, a plurality of development tools used in the *creation* of the application,” “integrating the module with an emulator of the wireless-connected device,” and “using the emulator to execute the application developed using the module within the IDE.” Further, Putzolu fails to supply that which Granade lacks. Putzolu relates to a network environment supporting mobile agents with permissioned access to resources. Putzolu fails to disclose developing an application for a wireless-connected device, executing the application on an emulator of a wireless-connected device, and integrating a module with development tools used in the creation of the application for the wireless-connected device.

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Granade and Putzolu, whether considered separately or in combination. Thus, dependent claims 14 and 15 are patentable over Granade and Putzolu for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Granade in view of Bales, and further in view of Putzolu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, none of Granade, Bales, and Putzolu disclose the limitations of independent claim 12. Specifically, none of the aforementioned references disclose an emulator for a wireless-connected device in an IDE that is used to execute an application developed for the wireless-connected device. Thus, it is clear that amended independent claim 12 is patentable over Granade, Bales, and Putzolu, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claim 16 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 16159.011001).

Dated: July 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord

Registration No.: 46,479

OSHA · LIANG LLP

1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800

Houston, Texas 77010

(713) 228-8600

(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant